

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/810,856	03/29/2004	Ganjiang Feng	839-1055	9113	
30024 NIXON & VA	7590 06/23/200 NDERHYE P.C.	EXAM	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH C	GLEBE ROAD, 11TH F	BALDWIN, GORDON			
ARLINGTON.	, VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/23/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)			
	10/810,856	FENG ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	GORDON R. BALDWIN	1794			

	GORDON R. BALDWIN	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the appropriat	o outonoion foo
Extensions of uniter injury be doublest united 57 GFR 1.130(a). The dependence have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 GFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 GFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two month	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	od Con attached Nation of Nau Co		DTOL 204)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imalı filad amandına	ot concelled the
non-allowable claim(s).	_ `_ `	•	
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		i be entered and an e	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 8-17.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		

/Timothy M. Speer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments in regard to the cobalt content and the proposed deficiency in Dardi and Strangman are not persuasive enough to traverse the teaching of these two references. As stated in the last office action, the teaching of cobalt in Strangman, while several of the examples do teach that only a trace amount of cobalt is used, in the abstract as well as in the summary of the invention, the coading for a superalloy turbine proponent can contain a cobalt ingredient in the range of 0-10%. By this teaching, the range of cobalt claimed by the applicant is considered to be met by the teaching of Strangman. If Strangman is given it broadest possible interpretation, it's considered overlap the respect study it by the applicant.

The applicant's secondary argument concerning the strengthening of the coating by the addition of tantatum and its claimed deleterious effects is not considered to be persuasive, even in light of the affidavit supplied by the applicant. First, if the Strangman reference is looked at in its broadest interpretation, then it teaches that tantatum can be in a range of 0-10%, thereby meaning that no tantatum can be present in the invention. While an example in Strangman may contain 7% tantatum, several other parts of Strangman disclose that 0% tantatum may be used.